

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 141 451

UD 017 060

AUTHOR Gordon, Edmund W.; Grannis, Joseph C.
TITLE Human Diversity, Program Evaluation and Pupil Assessment; And, A Critical Review of Black Consciousness, Identity and Achievement.
INSTITUTION Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Inst. for Urban and Minority Education.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 17p.
AVAILABLE FROM IRCD Bulletin, v.12, n. 1, Win 1977, Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, N.Y. 10027 (\$1.00)
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Achievement Tests; Black Colleges; *Black Students; *College Students; Compensatory Education Programs; Evaluation Methods; *Identification (Psychological); Individual Differences; Program Evaluation; Standardized Tests; *Student Attitudes; *Student Evaluation; *Testing Problems

ABSTRACT

The first of two papers included in this document addresses two related problems: Problem one: The appropriateness of existing standardized tests of achievement for the assessment of academic function in minority and disadvantaged group member students. Problem two: The appropriateness of such instruments for the assessment of the impact of large-scale educational programs. Gordon asserts that "the problem of large-scale evaluation...is larger than one of what kind of achievement tests to use." It may be that we could endure the problems related to the tests if we were better able to deal with such problems as the following: 1) the nebulousness and variability of treatments, 2) the complex economic, political, and social context in which the treatments are set, 3) the diversity of populations served and goals sought, 4) the reconciliation of necessary and sufficient conditions, and, 5) such limitations of evaluative research technology as: program and population specification, program and population sampling, interchangeable and dialectical nature of the dependent and independent variables, inappropriateness of extant statistical analyses for the study of the dynamic blending of variables by which effects may be explained, the policy of the best generic treatment, and, normative approaches to aggregate data in search of relationships that may be idiosyncratically expressed. The second paper in this document critically reviews the book "Black Consciousness, Identity and Achievement," by Patricia Gurin and Edgar Epps, New York: John Wiley, 1975. (Author/JM)

IRCD Bulletin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION



THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Publication of the
Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

Volume XII, Number 1 Winter 1977

Human Diversity, Program Evaluation and Pupil Assessment

Edmund W. Gordon

Considerable static has been raised over the past several years about two related but distinct problems. I say static because the disturbance signals have been fairly constant and loud, but not very clear. We know some things are not right, but we are not quite sure what they are and are even less certain about what ought to be done. The two related problems have to do with the following:

1. the appropriateness of existing standardized tests of achievement for the assessment of academic function in minority and disadvantaged group member students; and
2. the appropriateness of such instruments for the assessment of the impact of large-scale educational programs.

Let us turn our attention first to the problems that arise when we try to apply normative approaches to assessment to the appraisal of educational achievement in disadvantaged and low-status minority populations. Concern with this problem dates back at least to the forties when Davis and Eells sought approaches to assessment that were free of cultural loadings. As they discovered the futility of their efforts at developing tests that were culture free, they directed their search at the development of tests that were culture fair.

continued on page 2

This paper was originally presented at the Office of Education Invitational Conference on Achievement Testing of Disadvantaged and Minority Students, Reston, Va., in May 1976. It will be published with the other conference papers in Wargo, M.J. and Green, D.R. eds., *Achievement Testing of the Disadvantaged and Minority Students for Educational Program Evaluation*. Monterey, Cal.: CTB/McGraw-Hill, 1977. In press.

EDMUND W. GORDON, Ed.D. is Director of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Professor of Education, and Executive Director of the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

and A Critical Review of *Black Consciousness, Identity and Achievement**

Joseph C. Grannis

Patricia Gurin and Edgar Epps have conducted a major study of students in historically black southern colleges. Their book differentiates among both the students and the colleges in powerful and subtle ways. It identifies important relationships between background and personality characteristics of the students and their orientations to achievement and activism, and it demonstrates interactions between key personal variables and features of the college environments. By focusing on both the academic-occupational and the social-political aims and accomplishments of the students, Gurin and Epps have represented black concerns far more validly than attention to only one of these constellations of goals can reveal. Theirs is the first empirical study to illuminate, if not to answer finally, the question Carmichael and Hamilton stated anew in *Black Power* (1967), whether individual achievement and collective accomplishment are incompatible for blacks in the American system.

Variables of the Study

Nearly 5000 students were included altogether in a study of ten colleges in 1964-1965, a study in six of these colleges in 1970, and three longitudinal substudies of the students who were freshmen in one of the ten colleges in 1964-1965 (the class of 1968). It is only valid to speak of these students in the past tense. The present tense, however, would better capture the first point that this book drives home. Black students vary along the same dimensions that have differentiated nonblack students in other research. Just as Billingsley

continued on page 10

*Patricia Gurin and Edgar Epps. New York: John Wiley, 1975.

JOSEPH C. GRANNIS, Ph.D. is Associate Professor of Education, Research Associate of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education and of the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

These efforts, as you may recall, were more successful, but the instruments resulting from their work had low predictive value when subsequent achievement in academic settings was the referent.

As the civil and human rights movements of the fifties and sixties advanced, additional attention was focused on the inappropriateness of standardized tests for the assessment of minority group members. In this period, it was not unusual for psychometricians to add five to fifteen points to the scores of minority subjects to compensate for the assumed artificial depression in test scores resulting from the inappropriateness of the test. However, these added points were arrived at arbitrarily and reflected an assumed common and uniform depression in scores despite known differentials in the minority subjects' exposure to and involvement in the majority culture. The practice subsided as its illogic and its patronizing character became better recognized.

Other efforts have been directed at insuring the inclusion of minority group members in the populations on which the instruments are normed. This procedure, however, only slightly reduces the impact of the majority group's dominance in the norming procedure. A more sensitive accommodation, of course, is the development of population-specific norms and the use of such norms in the interpretation of the data. However, this practice has been questioned since the reality standard is performance in competitive academic and work situations with majority group members. This is also the criticism raised against population-specific instrumentation. The speaker who follows me, Brother Bob Williams, has done pioneering work in the development of a test of "black intelligence," or rather an achievement test, with black culture as the referent. I think Bob's data lead in to the same problem we have with population-specific norms. Unless and until the curricula and the criteria for mastery are made more congruent with the purposes and values of the target populations, the changed foci of assessment will continue to have low predictive value. Or, to be more accurate, the traditional curricula will continue to be inappropriate to the assessed behavior and potentials of the target groups. With all of these efforts proving to be somewhat unsuccessful, it is not surprising that by the early 1970's some of us are calling for a moratorium on the use of standardized tests with minority group members.

One could argue that what we have here is a political rather than a psychometric problem. This is especially likely to be the case so long as it appears that the objection to the standardized tests is based on the fact that minority group members tend to score less well than do majority group members. It is not so much the differential in minority group-majority group scores that leads me to question the appropriateness of standardized achievement tests and the normative approach to their interpretation. Increasingly, I am persuaded not only that such instruments and procedures are inappropriate for the assessment of achievement in minority and disadvantaged populations, but also that traditional standardized tests and normative approaches to assessment are dysfunctional and counterproductive to the purposes of pedagogy whenever we are confronted with the problems of educating populations with diverse characteristics.

When we first turned to the problems of educating educationally and socially disadvantaged children, a great deal of attention was given to the special characteristics of this population. The notions that dominated this new field were largely determined by conceptions of this population as homogeneous with respect to conditions of life and behavioral characteristics. We assumed a pervasive "culture of poverty." The population was largely identified by its deficits in comparison with characteristics assumed to be typical of the white middle class. Subsequent work and more careful study reveal that minority and disadvantaged children are not a homogeneous mass. In fact, there appears to be as much variation within populations so designated as there is between disadvantaged and more privileged groups. Diversity and heterogeneity, rather than deficiency and homogeneity, are now recognized as presenting the challenge. And, it is not only a challenge presented by children of low-status peoples; diversity in human characteristics increasingly is recognized as the central problem in pedagogical design for all peoples.

Learners differ in interests, in cognitive style, in rate of learning, in patterns of developed abilities, in motivation, in work habits, and in temperament, as well as in ethnicity, sex, and social class. In fact, it may well be that our preoccupation with such status and indicator variables as SES, sex, and ethnicity have retarded the scientific development of pedagogy. The differences associated with these status groups may have much less relevance for the design of educational treatments than do differences in behavioral function. When we refer to SES, we are using an indicator variable to imply the presence or absence of certain functional characteristics or circumstances that are presumed to influence learning and development. But the exchange of socialization strategies across SES designations makes social class a much less reliable indicator than we used to think. As sex roles change and are interchanged, and as ethnicity is confounded by social class, the specific characteristics of conditional and behavioral individuality provide better levers for, or guides to, educational planning. It is these characteristics of conditional and behavioral individuality that make for the pedagogically relevant dimensions of human diversity. It is these educationally relevant dimensions of diversity to

IRCD Bulletin

Published quarterly by the Institute for Urban and Minority Education. Subscription rate: \$4.00 per year. Back issues: 1-9 copies, \$1.00 each; 10-24 copies, \$0.80 each; 25-49 copies, \$0.60 each; 50 copies and over, \$0.50 each.

Edmund W. Gordon, Editor

Send all communications to: Institute for Urban and Minority Education, Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027.

The Institute for Urban and Minority Education is an agency for human resource development and school organization improvement in the nation's cities. Founded in 1973, the Institute is part of Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York.

which education must be responsive. Yet, it is conditional and behavioral individuality and diversity that normative and standardized approaches to assessment ignore and, in large measure, are designed to avoid. For example, test items are selected with a view toward their capacity to tap stable functions, and by stable we usually mean those functions less likely to be influenced by situational or personalistic variability. We demand that the items be presented in standardized and uniform conditions that are insensitive to differential response tendencies. The data of these tests are analyzed to reflect one's position in relation to a group norm rather than to reflect one's mastery of the task or the process by which one engages the task. It almost looks as if our tests were designed to be of no use to teachers since it is these processes of engagement, these differential response tendencies, these situational and personalistic variables that are of crucial importance in the design and management of teaching and learning transactions. I, therefore, assert that normative and standardized approaches to assessment are not only inappropriate for the assessment of achievement in minority and disadvantaged populations, but are also dysfunctional and counterproductive to pedagogy.

Glaser (1976) identified several reasons for the current dissatisfaction with standardized testing. He referred more specifically to tests of intelligence, but his argument is relevant here, particularly since I view intelligence tests as slightly more refined tests of achievement. Glaser wrote:

1. The present operational definition of intelligence (achievement) measures seems to have reached a plateau or asymptote of efficiency with our present technology. The predictive validity of tests has not increased for some time.
2. Since tests essentially measure general scholastic aptitude, they have not adequately recognized the discontinuity between the backgrounds and cultures of certain groups in our society and the requirements for succeeding in the conventional education system.
3. Tests reflect a restrictive overselective view of intelligence (achievement) that limits the educational system in adapting to students in order to maximize their achievement. In essence, the tests give go/no-go selective decisions but do not provide much deeper diagnosis for the conduct of education.
4. There is recognition that test theory and technique have not made contact with modern psychological theories of learning and cognition, and that test development should be influenced by new developments in these areas. Modern theory brings us close to understanding the components of cognitive functioning and can help us succeed in analyzing and understanding the detailed processes underlying intellectual abilities — the initial task that Binet set for himself, but had to abandon.

Why has the circumstance come about and why does it persist? Much of the impetus for the development of a technology of assessment related to intellective function and achievement resulted from, and has been maintained by, a supply-and-demand approach to access to education and the dis-

tribution of educational opportunities. Prior to the twentieth century, access to a limited supply of educational opportunities was guarded by selection procedures based upon the prospective student's social status — in the pre-Reformation period, access was limited to the political and religious nobility, later it was limited to other privileged classes. Twentieth-century selection procedures have come to be dominated by the student's demonstrated or predicted intellectual status. Where the supply of opportunities has been limited, great emphasis has been placed on the selection of students and the prediction of their performance when exposed to those opportunities. Binet's work in intelligence test development was directed toward the creation of an instrument that could be used to identify those pupils who were likely to benefit from schooling. His admonitions that we also turn to treatment of those expected not to succeed were generally ignored. In a period of scarce educational opportunities, Binet's concern for the educability of intelligence did not gain favor. Society found greater utility in the promise of the predictive and selective validity of his new test.

This emphasis on selection and prediction has continued even though the social conditions that gave rise to it have changed. In recent years, we have seen in the U.S.A. a growing concern with universal access to education. The educational product requirements of the nation are more frequently coming to be defined in terms of our capability to provide postsecondary educational opportunities for the majority of our youth and a continued program of learning for most of our citizens. If this trend continues, selection and prediction can no longer be allowed to dominate the technology of psycho-educational appraisal; rather, the stage must be shared with an emphasis on *description* and *prescription* (i.e., the qualitative description of intellective function, leading *not* to the selection of those most likely to succeed but to the prescription of the learning experiences required to insure more adequately that academic success is possible).

The position being advanced here is that psychological testing obviously can be used to measure achieved development. Using those measurements, we can predict, with reasonable validity, subsequent achievement in the same dimensions of behavior under similar learning experience conditions. Thus, persons who have learned an average amount during one learning period (high school) may be expected to learn an average amount in the next learning period (college). However, we have not given adequate attention to the fact that psychological testing can be used for the following purposes: (a) to describe and qualitatively analyze behavior function in order to gain a better understanding of the processes by which achievement is developed, (b) to describe nonstandard achievements that may be equally as functional in subsequent situations requiring adaptation, or (c) to specify the conditions in the interaction between learner and learning experience that may be necessary to change the quality of future achievements.

If we are to approach such goals in achievement testing, we will need to redress the imbalance made more obvious by the growing recognition of individual and group differences in function, on the one hand, contrasted with a

fairly undifferentiated measurement technology on the other. Until such progress is made, the logic of my position forces me to endorse the call for a moratorium on the traditional usages of standardized achievement testing and its normative interpretation as not in the best educational interests of minority and disadvantaged populations.

Let me turn quickly to the second issue, that is, the appropriateness of the use of standardized and normative approaches to testing in the assessment of the impact of large-scale educational programs. There are several interrelated problems here. Before discussing them, I need to make certain that the record shows that I am consistent. Since I have argued that these tests should not be used in traditional ways with minority and disadvantaged populations, I must also argue that they not be used to assess large-scale educational programs directed at these populations. In his academic lecture at the 1973 American Psychological Association annual meeting, Donald Hebb quoted one of his favorite admonitions, "If something is not worth doing, it is also not worth doing well!" To paraphrase, if these tests are not worth using, they are also not worth using on a large scale to make decisions about children's lives and to inform public policy. But the problems of the evaluation of these programs are much bigger than the question of whether to test or not to test, or what tests to use.

I estimate that we have invested since 1965 between one-half and three-fourths of a billion dollars in evaluations of educational programs for the disadvantaged. There are currently two major studies underway — a five-million-dollar NIE study and an Office of Education study that I once heard estimated as possibly costing twenty-one million dollars over a seven-year period. Those are big sums of money even in periods of inflation. Yet, having examined the RFP for the OE study and having been rather close to the NIE study, I am not at all confident that either will provide the kind of guidance for the relevant policy decisions that is needed or expected. Like their predecessor studies, they are likely to produce equivocal findings. It is not because we don't have good and intelligent people designing and conducting these studies. When I went to Washington in 1965 to provide leadership in the development of the research and evaluation program for Project Head Start, a friend who is one of our most distinguished authorities in educational measurement and research declined to assist me. He indicated that he would not touch such an evaluation as Head Start or Title I with a fifty-foot pole because it was an impossible task in view of the absence of better agreement on what the treatment is, the conditions under which it is delivered, and the absence of assessment instruments appropriate to the treatment, the conditions, and the populations served. Nonetheless, I went ahead and found good people to advise and to help, but no single one of us was, nor together were, good enough to overcome the constraining problems to which my friend called my attention as he sympathetically refused to join me in my folly. You know, it is my belief that if I were to ask him again today, he would still refuse because we have not adequately addressed the problems he raised. Yet, we continue large-scale evaluations and continue to make the same errors and continue to produce negative or confusing results. One

wonders if there is a conspiracy to prove that such programs cannot succeed, that minority and disadvantaged people cannot be educated, that it is poor policy to continue heavy investments of public funds in efforts at equalizing educational opportunity. When one puts these evaluations together with the race and genetics debate and with the "schooling doesn't make a difference" pronouncements, it is exceedingly difficult to keep the faith.

I know that this meeting was not called to discuss the problem of large-scale evaluation, but it is important for us to understand that the problem is larger than one of what kind of achievement tests to use. It may be that we could endure the problems related to the tests if we were better able to deal with such problems as the following:

1. the nebulosity and variability of treatments
2. the complex economic, political, and social context in which the treatments are set
3. the diversity of populations served and goals sought
4. the reconciliation of necessary and sufficient conditions for change and growth
5. such limitations of evaluative research technology as:
 - a. program and population specification
 - b. program and population sampling
 - c. interchangeable and dialectical nature of the dependent and independent variables
 - d. inappropriateness of extant statistical analyses for the study of the dynamic blending of variables by which effects may be explained
 - e. the policy of the best generic treatment
 - f. normative approaches to aggregate data in search of relationships that may be idiosyncratically expressed.

It may be that some of these problems will be the focus of our next conference. For the present, let us return to achievement testing. What are the limitations of these tests for educational program evaluation? Suchman described five levels of evaluation research (Suchman, 1967).

1. Evaluation should answer questions as to quantity and quality of treatment. Was treatment delivered, how much, and how good?
2. Evaluation should answer questions relative to performance or impact. Did any change occur that can be inferred to have resulted from the treatment? What are the intended as well as unintended consequences?
3. Evaluation should address the question of adequacy. To what degree are the results adequate to relieve the problem to which the treatment was applied?
4. Evaluation should address questions of efficiency. Is there a better way to achieve equivalent results?
5. Evaluation should address questions of process and explanation. How and why did the treatment work or fail?

Obviously, questions as to the nature and quantity of treatment or its efficiency cannot be addressed directly by achievement test data. However, questions of performance/impact, of adequacy, and of process/explanation could and should be addressed by achievement data. The problem is that standardized norm-based tests contribute very little to

these questions. In their present state, these tests tell us something about performance in relation to some reference group. They enable us to make crude go/no-go decisions. They provide data that in the aggregate inform us with respect to positive, zero, or negative impact. We may infer adequacy of treatment from the relative position of the respondents, but since the tests tend not to be specifically related to the criteria of competence, they tell us little about the adequacy of the performance or treatment in relation to need. Similarly, these tests are not directed at illuminating aspects of process. Although underlying processes can be inferred from the analysis of some of the items, assessment of the process variables by which performance-treatment interactions can be judged is not the current purpose of capability of these tests. In fact, the very processes by which we develop them are counterproductive as far as data that speak to questions of adequacy, process, and explanation are concerned. As we strive to achieve reliability and validity, we are forced to eliminate items sensitive to situational and personalistic variance, or otherwise unstable. What we look for are items that are least influenced by variations in instruction or in pupils. In sum, I am asserting that if good evaluation data are needed to inform policy decision-making, then good evaluation procedures and instrumentation must be applied. Since the achievement tests available to us fail to address crucial evaluation questions, they are inadequate to the task at hand. In commenting on a related point, Calfee (1976) wrote: "If a principal, superintendent or program director (or legislator) is to make informed, rational decisions about the strengths and weaknesses of the teaching and learning that take place under his supervision, something more than a gross characterization of success or failure is necessary." I think I cannot be accused of overstating the case when I claim that traditional approaches to norm-based standardized testing fail to provide more than gross characterizations of success and failure. This is true of their use with all children. When we use them to assess achievement in and programs for the poor, the disadvantaged, and the discriminated against, the problem is compounded.

Given this low estimate of the utility of normative and standardized approaches to achievement testing and the equally low likelihood that the call for a moratorium will be heeded, what can be done to improve upon the current state of the arts?

Despite my criticisms of the extant standardized instruments, they need not be immediately discarded. A great deal of work has gone into the development of item pools that tap a variety of intellectual functions. The problem is that these items have been grouped, presented, scored, and analyzed with a view toward gross classification with respect to success or failure, with a view toward distributing the examinee population over the bell-shaped curve, and with a view toward predicting who will succeed. These same instruments can, however, be analyzed for the following purposes:

1. To identify the dimensional or categorical functional demands of selected standardized tests. What dimensions of function appear to be tapped by the instrument as these can be conceptualized from a surface examination of item content?

2. To determine the rationale utilized in the development of each of several tests in order to identify the conceptual categories for which items were written and into which item-response consistencies might cluster empirically.
3. To determine the learning-task demands represented by the items of selected tests and the classification of those demands into functional categories. The extent to which selected tests provide adequate coverage of the typical learning-task demands found in educational settings might also be appraised. Are the tests measuring the processes required by important learning tasks? What types of learning-task demands correspond to the processes ostensibly measured by the test?
4. To utilize the categories produced by any or all of the above strategies in the metric and nonmetric factorial analysis of test data in order to uncover empirical dimensions of test responses. These dimensions could be interpreted in the context of item clusters derived from the conceptual and task analytic strategies described above to ascertain the context to which they provide an empirical foundation for those clusters or require a reconceptualization of response processes. The empirical dimensions could then be used to produce individual and group profiles reflecting across the several categories or factors.

Numbers 1, 2, and 3 above are intended to unbundle existing standardized tests and to reveal their factorial demand structure. They are basic to number 4, which involves the analysis of performance data to reveal diagnostic patterns that become the basis for the profiles suggested in number four.

In addition, with these same instruments we could do the following:

1. Explore possibilities for adding to their quantitative reports on the performance of students, reports descriptive of the patterns of achievement and function derived from the qualitative analysis of existing tests. Existing instruments should be examined with a view to categorization, factorial analysis, and interpretation to determine whether the data of these instruments can be reported in descriptive and qualitative ways, in addition to the traditional quantitative report. For example, response patterns might be prepared differentially for:
 - a. Information recall
 - (1) Rote recall
 - (2) Associative recall
 - (3) Derivative recall
 - b. Vocabulary
 - (1) Absolute
 - (2) Contextual
2. Move away from existing instruments and explore the development of test items and procedures that lend themselves to descriptive and qualitative analyses of cognitive and affective adaptive functions, in addition to wider specific achievements.

- a. In the development of new tests, attention should be given to the appraisal of
 - (1) Adaptation in new learning situations
 - (2) Problem solving in situations that require varied cognitive skills and styles
 - (3) Analysis, search, and synthesis behaviors
 - (4) Information management, processing, and utilization skills
 - (5) Nonstandard information pools
- b. In the development of new procedures, attention should be given to the appraisal of
 - (1) Comprehension through experiences, listening, and looking, as well as reading
 - (2) Expression through artistic, oral, nonverbal, and graphic, as well as written symbolization
 - (3) Characteristics of temperament
 - (4) Sources and status of motivation
 - (5) Habits of work and task involvement under varying conditions of demand
- c. In the development of tests and procedures designed to get at specific achievements, attention should be given to
 - (1) Broadening the varieties of subject matter, competencies, and the skills assessed
 - (2) Examining the achievements in a variety of contexts
 - (3) Open-ended and unstructured probes of achievement to allow for atypical patterns and varieties of achievement
 - (4) Assessing nonacademic achievements such as social competence, coping skills, avocational skills, and artistic, athletic, political, or mechanical skills

Calfee and others have been experimenting with some alternative approaches to prediction based on "all-or-none tests." They assert that there are some indicator skills the mastery of which is essential to next steps in learning. Knowledge of the alphabet is an example of such a skill. It is known to be predictive of subsequent performance on reading achievement tests. Calfee asserts that "alphabet knowledge is an indicator, not a cause, of reading success and failure." On the basis of empirical data, one can determine "cut-off points" by which we can predict success or failure in reading mastery. It is basically a criterion-referenced test procedure in which the criterion is based upon specific skills or competencies known to be indicative of readiness for the next level of work. The procedure can be used as a diagnostic screening device, as a tool of pupil evaluation, as an instrument of program evaluation, or in needs assessment. It does not identify process, but is an indicator of success or failure in a crucial element in process.

Another alternative is represented by Project TORQUE, which claims to develop tests that help teachers help students. TORQUE can also be used to evaluate large groups of students or to assess the impact of particular curriculum materials. The developers of the test claim that their instrument is diagnostic, that it identifies what children know and do well, as well as pinpointing children's problems

closely enough to help guide further instruction. They claim sensitivity to children's varied characteristics. All of this is made available through a criterion-referenced model easily administered by teachers.

Obviously, criterion-referenced testing is one of the alternatives available to us. Since there is a session scheduled on this subject, I will not discuss the approach further except for a cautionary note.

Tradition weighs heavily on all of us. We tend to try to legitimize the new by reference to the old. In a number of instances, we try to demonstrate the goodness or validity of a criterion-referenced test by showing that it correlates well with an achievement or intelligence test. That may be necessary to gain respectability or acceptance, but it can defeat the purpose behind our movement away from norm-based standardized testing. For example, when we were selecting instruments with which to assess the impact of the early Head Start efforts, we asked Bettye Caldwell to develop an idea she had for a criterion-referenced test of mastery of those developmental and preliteracy skills judged to be associated with successful school entry. The Caldwell Preschool Inventory was the result. However, in an effort to gain credibility for the Inventory and later for the impact data generated therefrom, we added standardized tests of intelligence and achievement to the battery. As the pressure to demonstrate Head Start's effectiveness mounted, the criterion-referenced test was dropped and the standardized test remained, even though it was the Caldwell Inventory that best addressed the growth in skills that was the goal of the special program. Else Haussermann went into retirement regretting that her excellent procedures for assessing learning processes in children with cerebral damage had not been standardized and age-group norms established. So heavily did tradition weigh on her conception of what she was doing that she never was convinced that her criterion-referenced techniques derived a great part of their value from the fact that they were not constrained by standardization and the interpretation of the data was not limited by norm-based scoring.

One final example. In a highly diagnostic mode, Glaser described a performance analytic approach to the assessment of memory function. Drawing upon a conceptualization of the processes involved in short-term memory for sequences of items, he suggested that analyses of performance based upon such conceptualizations may have implications for assessing individual differences as well as for improving performance. Glaser wrote:

A young or mentally retarded child might fail the test because of insufficient familiarity with the sequence of ordinal numbers, or because of inexperience in using the number sequence to order other materials. An individual may not perform well because he has not developed the grouping and chunking strategy characteristic of his age level, although he might utilize grouping when prompted by the examiner. Another individual may not be able to accomplish the coding process necessary to take advantage of chunking. Others might lack the capacity for holding back their working memory storage long enough to order their output

properly. With the advantage of this kind of added theoretical insight to augment the conventional intelligence test digit span sub-test, it might be possible to localize the source of difficulty for an individual who fails under the standard procedure. This could be of considerable help in indicating how deficient performance in this and related tasks might be remedied.

Studies like those just described raise the possibility that measures of intelligence and aptitude, analyzed in terms of cognitive processes, will move intelligence and aptitude test predictions from static statements about the probability of success to dynamic statements about what can be done to increase the likelihood of school success. Hopefully, this viewpoint will lead to measuring instruments which are diagnostic, in the sense that they tell us how educational institutions should adjust to the person, instead of simply telling us, as most intelligence tests do, which people already are adjusted to the institution.

Educational assessment of individuals and programs greatly influences what happens in the delivery of educational services. Whether we like it or not, whether we intend it or not, what teachers teach and the way they teach are in large measure determined by the characteristics of the assessment instruments and programs. In addition, the results of what we do in evaluation no longer remain hidden away in dusty files. Our findings are more and more frequently used to support the biases and purposes of public policy makers. Thus, what we measure and the way we measure it impinge heavily on the lives of individuals and on the society in general. These observations seem to suggest that the problems we face are not only technical, but also involve philosophical and moral issues:

- What is it that we want education to be?
- What are the behaviors and goals of educators and learners that we are willing to encourage?
- What priorities in public policy are we willing to support?
- What is the contribution of our work to the achievement of social justice?

REFERENCES

- Calfee, Robert. "Practical Uses of Assessment for Individualized Reading Instruction." Unpublished proceedings of the Conference on Beginning Reading Instruction. University of Pittsburgh, LRDC, May, 1976.
- Glaser, Robert. "On Intelligence and Aptitudes." Unpublished paper read at the Work Conference on Exploring Alternatives to Current Standardized Tests. University of Pittsburgh, May, 1976.
- Haeussermann, Else. *Developmental potential of preschool children*. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1958.
- Hayden, Robert C. *Project Torque: a new approach to the assessment of children's mathematical competence*. Newton, Mass: Educational Development Center, 1976.

- Hebb, Donald. "What Psychology is About." *American Psychologist*, February, 1974, 71.
- Suchman, Edward A. *Evaluative research: principles and practice in public service and social action programs*. New York: Russell Sage, 1967.
- Williams, Robert L. "The BITCH-100: A Culture Specific Test." *The Journal of Afro American Issues* 3, No. 1 (Winter 1975): 103.

ANNOUNCING THE IUME REPORT SERIES

The Institute for Urban and Minority Education is pleased to announce the first five titles of the IUME Report Series which are available for \$1.00 each from

IUME
Box 40
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

- No. 1 New York City Spanish: Myths, Structure and States, William G. Milan. 1976.
- No. 2 Psychological Anthropology and Educational Practice, Charles C. Harrington. 1976.
- No. 3 Project Talent: An Empirical Study to Aid in Formulating Educational Goals — Reflections on the Changing Role and Sources of Guidance in the Process of Student Development, Edmund W. Gordon. 1976.
- No. 4 Textbooks and Political Socialization: A Multivariate Analysis, Charles C. Harrington. 1976.
- No. 5 The Nonimplementation of EEP: "All That Money for Business as Usual." Constancia Warren. 1976.

INSTITUTES

The Second Annual Regional Conference on BILINGUAL EDUCATION

sponsored by "Bilingual" General Assistance Center and
the Institute for Urban and Minority Education

SATURDAY, JUNE 4, 1977

9 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. at Teachers College, Columbia University
525 West 120th Street, New York, New York

Speakers include: Pasquita Ayala
Lawrence A. Cremin
Edmund W. Gordon
Charles Harrington
Maria Antonia Irizarry
Harold J. Noah
A. Harry Passow
Carmen Rodriguez
and the staff of the
"Bilingual" General Assistance Center
at Teachers College

For information call or write:

Ms. Ada Anglada
"Bilingual" General Assistance Center
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027
(212) 678-3155

Department of Special Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

A SUMMER TRAINING INSTITUTE on The Learning Potential Assessment Device (LPAD) and Instrumental Enrichment (IE)

conducted by Dr. Reuven Feuerstein
and his staff of the Hadassah-WIZO-Canada Research Institute, Jerusalem, Israel
at Teachers College, Columbia University
525 West 120th Street, New York, New York

August 1-12, 1977

Dr. Feuerstein and his staff will devote the first week to
elaborating on the theoretical framework of LPAD and train-
ing institute participants to administer this test effectively to
adolescents with serious learning problems. The second week
will be devoted to training clinicians and teachers in the use of
IE as a psycho-educational tool for enhancing cognitive skills
particularly among adolescents who are failing at school.

For additional information, contact:

Professor Abraham Tannenbaum
Department of Special Education
Box 223
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

CONFERENCE

INSTITUTE ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION

at Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027

June 6-30, 1977

Sociolinguistic Foundations of Bilingual Education

Four-week course, June 6-30, 1977

Prof. Joshua A. Fishman (Yeshiva University)

"Language Planning" as an approach to language concerns, particularly bilingual education. Study of the social contexts of bilingual education through an explanation of typologies, societal parameters, local studies and demographics. Classroom dynamics and other processes of bilingual education in social perspective, including academic and non-academic outcomes of bilingual education; comparisons between cross-cultural profiles.

Comparative Bilingual Education: Wales, USSR, USA

Four-week course, June 6-30, 1977

Prof. E. Glyn Lewis (University of Swansea, Wales)

Historical and contemporary aspects of bilingual education including the study of expanding educational opportunity. Review of theory and models as well as comparisons of examples in several countries: Britain, Belgium, Soviet Union, Canada, U.S. Largely sociological approach with some comparative studies of the psychological and linguistic aspects of bilingual education.

Methods and Materials of Bilingual Education

Two-week course, June 20-30, 1977

Mrs. Maria M. Swanson (Bilingual Education Service Center)

Linguistic and cultural considerations in bilingual education, including instructional techniques in content areas, language development and selection and adaptation of material. An examination of classroom management and its application to specific school settings and student populations; development of curriculum units and instructional learning packets.

Psycholinguistic Foundations of Bilingual Education, Part I: Cognitive Processes

Two-week course, June 6-17, 1977

Prof. Wallace E. Lambert (Mc Gill University)

Psychological factors that underlie bilingual education in North America, particularly those relevant to motivation, perception and their roles in second-language learning or first language maintenance; the importance of identity feelings in multicultural society; and the impact of various forms of bilingualism on intellectual and cognitive development. Opportunities to develop educational and psychological research skills.

Psycholinguistic Foundations of Bilingual Education, Part II: Academic Outcomes

Two-week course, June 20-30, 1977

Prof. Frederick Genesee (Mc Gill University)

The process of bilingual education with special emphasis on pedagogical issues; assessment of effectiveness of bilingual education; individual student differences in successful bilingual education; acquisition of language skills; and the role of the teacher in bilingual education.

Colloquium on Bilingual Education

Four-week course, June 6-30, 1977

All Faculty

Guided Research in Bilingual Education

Four-week course, June 6-30, 1977

All Faculty

For further information, contact: Mrs. Effie M. Bynum

Box 75, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York 10027
(212) 678-3780

(1968) and other contemporary scholars have demonstrated how inadequately the matrifocal stereotype describes the diversity of black families in America, so Gurin and Epps unmask the stereotyping of black students, more specifically the students in black southern colleges who were the object of their research.

The students varied in the traditionality and the prestige and difficulty levels of their occupational aspirations. They had varied perceptions of the opportunities open to them in different work sectors and geographic regions. They varied in their sense of personal control in their lives and in their beliefs about control in society generally, in their expectations of academic success, and in their needs for achievement, success, and security. They varied further in their concern with racial identity, their concern with integration, their analyses of racial inequities, and their social change strategies. They were male and female. They came from both rural and urban settings, and from families of different social structures and income levels. The import of a number of these variations turned out to be quite different from what one would have predicted from prevailing stereotypes.

The colleges in which Gurin and Epps did their research were a purposive sample of historically black colleges, varying in their being public or private institutions, in their academic prestige, and in the size of their student bodies. The colleges were found to vary as well in their students' backgrounds and entering orientations, the diversity of student activities, the amount of student-faculty interaction, and their student cultures: the students' criticism of traditional academic governance, the students' activism, the students' breadth of extracurricular involvement, their extracurricular leadership, their support of fraternities and sororities, and the academic stress in the student culture.

The Plan of the Book

How does one penetrate this mass of variables? The plan of the book is straightforward. It asks first what factors influenced the students' individual achievement: their academic and occupational aspirations, academic performance, and achievement motivation. Next it investigates what the authors call collective achievement: group action and collective commitments. Last, the relationship between individual and collective achievement is examined: the ways in which different students focused more on one or the other concern or, in the phrase Gurin and Epps use, "put it all together."

The statistical strategy of the research has strengths and limitations. The following quotation omits the authors' technical discussion, but conveys the idea of the analysis they use to greatest effect:

In many analyses in this book we are interested in examining the effects of a number of variables on a given dependent variable, such as occupational aspirations. One technique particularly well suited to our purpose is the Multiple Classification Analysis.... To illustrate what we accomplish using this technique,

consider the effect of father absence on whether the father exercised influence over the child's decision to go to college. As expected, fathers who did not live in the home were reported by their children as less influential on the college decision. Since we know that father-absent families also have lower family incomes and, furthermore, that the father's influence in the college decision is affected by total family income, we want to know whether father absence is important after adjusting for the effects of family income. The MCA provides an estimate of the father absence effect by indicating what its effect would be if family income among father-absent families were exactly the same as it is for the total sample. (p. 117)

A limitation of these analyses that the authors themselves discuss is the difficulty of drawing causal inferences from correlations when the variables being correlated were measured simultaneously. The three substudies in which they followed 1964-1965 freshmen in one college over the course of four years escape this limitation most effectively. In the larger 1964 study, the fact that grades reflected academic achievement at the end of a college year, while the questionnaire tapping demographic and orientation variables was administered at registration, gives some temporal perspective to the relationships between achievement and these other variables. Again, aspirations and motivation were measured at both the beginning and the end of the academic year for the freshmen in all ten colleges in the 1964 study. Other analyses are somewhat weaker in this regard.

Gurin and Epps regularly refer to the findings of other research, though not always to agree with previous conclusions. Overall, the argument is both careful and bold. Virtually every sentence contains new information or new reasoning, and on these grounds alone the book is difficult to read. One can only summarize its findings by leaving behind most of the context that gives them their credibility.

Individual Achievement

Between 80 and 90 percent of the students in the 1964 and 1970 studies aspired to enter a profession, and similar proportions wanted to continue their education in graduate or professional school. These proportions were higher than the national averages in 1964, a year for which comparable national statistics are available. However, only between 8 and 20 percent of the students were certain they would be able to continue beyond the baccalaureate. This correlates strongly with their families' income levels. Proportionally five times as many students in this sample — and indeed in black colleges generally — as white students in white colleges during a comparable year came from families whose incomes were below the poverty line. Seventy percent of the students worked while in college, and more than fifty percent borrowed money. Gurin and Epps juxtapose these findings with the fact, established in other research, that the students in historically black colleges place above the national average in completing their bachelor's degrees. The students' per-

sistence and the colleges' tenacity are manifest in these data, as is the need for increased financial support of black students' postbaccalaureate studies.

As the job a given student aspired to was rated by the student's peers, student occupational aspirations, overall, were higher in terms of prestige, ability demands, and social difficulty ("the relative chances a black and a white applicant, equally trained, would have getting the job in the same city in the same sector of the country" p. 47). They were also high in nontraditionality, on the basis of a comparison with the percentage of blacks who were jobholders in a given category in 1960. The students varied considerably, nonetheless, in the ability demands and social difficulty of the jobs they aspired to, and sufficiently in the prestige and nontraditionality of the jobs to raise questions about the factors that might account for these variations.

Sex role strongly influenced the students' graduate study and occupational aspirations. "Contrary to stereotyped notions about the dominance of Black women, the picture of high aspiration fit the men students much better than the women. The goals of women students reflected lower levels on almost every measure of aspiration (p. 48)."

The differences between the men's and the women's aspirations — for example, that three times as many men as women planned to pursue doctorate or professional degrees — very closely corresponded to the differences that other studies have shown to obtain for men and women college students nationally. The men and women rated job prestige and difficulty levels identically, but they differed greatly in their opinions of which jobs would be the most personally desirable. The prestige and difficulty levels of the jobs the women aspired to were substantially lower than those of the men. Reading Gurin and Epps's discussion of these findings, one is appalled both that the pattern of the encompassing culture applies so strongly for blacks, and that the matri-focal stereotype interferes so strongly with the recognition of this.

Following these first findings there appears in the book an analysis of "the motivational dynamics of aspiration and performance" that is treated as a cornerstone of the argument as a whole. Rotter's Internal-External Control Scale is shown to contain two types of items rather than the one type originally supposed, at least as black students respond to these items, and possibly as more socially conscious white students would respond to them. One set of items the authors call "sense of personal control," the others they call "control ideology." Students who consistently chose the internal statement on the personal control items "showed a strong conviction that they could control what happened in their lives." Choosing the internal statement on the control ideology items "meant rejecting the belief that success follows from luck, the right breaks, or knowing the right people in favor of the traditional Protestant ethic explanation of success" (p. 71).

From previous research the authors infer that black students in America on the average have subscribed to an internal control *ideology* as much as white students have, but that they have felt less *personal* control over their lives. In the present study the authors probe the consequences of

these different convictions. Students' internal sense of *personal* control was positively related for both men and women to cumulative grades, prestige of occupational aspiration, ability demands of occupational aspiration, and graduate or professional school aspiration. There were several other such relationships for men or women only. Internal control *ideology*, on the other hand, bore no positive relationship to any measure of academic achievement or occupational and academic aspiration. For students with a high sense of personal control, control ideology was simply irrelevant to these measures. For students with a low sense of personal control, however, internal control ideology related negatively to several of the measures. In other words, lack of confidence in personal ability to control one's own life, combined with a strong belief in the Protestant ethic, was particularly debilitating to academic achievement and occupational and academic aspiration.

Did the structures of the students' families, their rural or their urban settings, or the families' income levels affect the internality of their personal control or control ideology? Inexplicably, and creating much frustration for the reader, it is difficult to find where Gurin and Epps address this question. They nowhere use the specific phrases "personal control" and "control ideology" in the chapter on precollege background that immediately follows the motivational dynamics chapter. One finally infers from a table on "work ethic values" in the Appendix for this chapter, and from a similar table on "control ideology" for a later chapter, that the ideology variable has been renamed and that it related to none of the demographic variables except, for men, the rural or urban setting of the place the student lived for most of his life. But comparable data is nowhere available for internal control.

The surrounding pieces of the puzzle are presented, and they are striking indeed. Gurin and Epps summarize their findings as follows:

1. Social background simply did not influence college performance or performance on typical achievement motivation tasks.
2. At the freshman level men from very poor families and from families with low educational attainments held lower job aspirations than any other group of men. Women from such families also held lower aspirations, especially as compared to freshman women from families with moderate incomes and some college education in the previous generation.
3. Social background was not significantly related to either achievement motives or values.
4. The opportunity aspects of the students' precollege environments, especially the level of their family incomes and rural setting of their homes, did influence expectancies of success. Although students from such backgrounds attached the same importance as other students to getting an advanced degree, they were considerably less certain that they would be able to realize that goal. Similarly, students from rural areas and low income families assessed their chances of actually getting

the jobs they desire at a much lower level of probability despite feeling equally self-confident about their abilities to perform at those jobs (p. 123).

The "achievement motives and values" referred to in this summary might appear to include the personal control variable, but this is not clear either in the text or in the appendices. Achievement motivation data obtained from several other instruments are reported along with the work ethic data and the findings from a general life values measure. One wants to see precisely how personal control fits into the total picture. That it is not influenced by family structure is consistent with the general argument, which would be strengthened by evidence on the question. But that it should not be affected by family income is less apparent. At what points in the interface between blacks and the American system *do* we account for black students' having, overall, less sense of personal control over their lives? Gurin and Epps themselves make the following summary statement later in the book:

We saw no evidence that achievement-related values — those pertaining to ambition, hard work, success, materialism, or immediate and long-term gratification — reflected the students' social backgrounds. But social background did influence expectations of success, which further influenced aspirations. Moreover, the aspects of the background that especially influenced expectancies and aspirations were closely tied to opportunity and resources. Family income and rural-urban residence were far more influential than either parental education or family structure. (p. 185)

Even without the missing piece on personal control, this is a very powerful set of findings. Though two weighty parts of the book remain, this already established it as a landmark study.

In such a complicated study, decisions about what to present to the reader must have been extraordinarily difficult, as was, the authors observe themselves, the original collection of the data. One admires both the breadth of the research and its precision in countless details. The authors recognize that the students in their sample are, by the very fact of their being in college, not necessarily representative of black youth in general. From an opposite standpoint, however, the students can be said not to have been immune to the motivational dynamics that Gurin and Epps hypothesized. A longitudinal substudy in one of the colleges compared dropouts with students who completed their degrees and suggested further subtleties of these dynamics that have counseling implications. The follow-up questionnaire administered to all of the freshmen in the ten colleges at the end of the 1964-1965 school year revealed effects of the college environments on the students' motivation and aspirations:

Generally, we have found that the 10 colleges showed different levels of student aspiration and motivation either because they selected students who already differed when they entered college, because certain colleges were able to buffer their students against the

general tendency of lowering aspirations during the freshman year while other colleges were not, or because the college experience actually accentuated the initial differences the entering freshmen brought to these 10 colleges. (p. 169-170)

In three colleges, Gurin and Epps discovered patterns that went beyond, and in some respects presented exceptions to, these general trends. In one, a small private college of high academic repute that traditionally sent many students on to graduate school, the students not only entered with high occupational and academic aspirations, but also completed the freshman year with aspirations that were still higher. The student culture in this college was found to be relatively nonactivist and to stress academic values the most strongly of all the colleges. More than this, the faculty was observed, by students and researchers alike, to be extraordinarily concerned with the individual growth of virtually every student. Some students, particularly those of more urban origin, resented the one-big-happy-family approach of this faculty. Many more appreciated it, however, and Gurin and Epps link its success in promoting achievement to a more communal, rather than competitive, approach to students' development. A second college at best maintained, and in some respects depressed, originally high motivation and aspirations. This was an elite black college with a reputation for political activism, but in which students' actual participation in protest or governance actions, or indeed in extracurricular activities generally, was found to be quite low. The college was also known for its graduates' unusual achievements, but the students seemed to feel that their simply being in the college guaranteed them this achievement. Overall, the stance of the students in this college reflected disengagement. Finally, in a third college, students' motivation and aspirations were redirected, from somewhat low to higher job and postcollege educational aspirations, and from security concerns to a greater concern about success and status. These shifts took place at the same time that the students' academic performance was considerably lower than would have been predicted from their SAT's on entering college. They seemed to be more bent on "doing something unusual that is recognized as significant," and were supported in this by an environment where "the new, the different, and the unconventional were entertained amidst the much more prevailing traditional influences in the state." Gurin and Epps imply that these new interests merged individual with collective achievement. Following this third case study, the authors make their transition to the second part of the book, which focuses on group action and collective commitments.

Collective Achievement

It was in February, 1960 that black students sat in at a lunch counter in Greensboro, North Carolina, sparking a civil rights movement that spread throughout the Old South. By the summer of 1964, substantial victories, culminating in the Civil Rights Act, and setbacks, notably the 1964 Democratic National Convention compromise over the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party's challenge to traditional white

control, had occurred. Students' offcampus activism peaked during the Selma and Montgomery marches of 1965. Thereafter, students continued to be concerned with civil rights, but they focused increasing attention on the governance of college programs and campus life. Gurin and Epps discuss these events as the historical-political context in which their 1964 and 1970 studies were set.

Most of the 1964 students indicated their commitment to integration, racial pride, and both socioeconomic (system-blaming) and individualistic (self-blaming) explanations of racial inequities. Few showed any evidence of the negative identification so often attributed to blacks, but few preferred collective to individual action as a social change strategy. Between 1964 and 1970 there were distinct changes in the student's convictions. The students became more cynical about the likelihood of integration. They shifted strongly away from individual to ward more system-blaming explanations of inequities and, correspondingly, from internal toward more external control ideologies. They also increased their preference for collective action over individual mobility as the way to deal with the system. The ideology of black nationalism displaced integration as the major frame of reference for the students' convictions. Throughout the country black students were more active than white students in both the civil rights and the college governance struggles, and the students in the colleges Gurin and Epps studied participated at these same high levels. Still, some of the students participated more than others, while some did not participate at all. Thus the authors ask what variables correlated with student activism and black nationalism.

Of five demographic variables examined — rural or urban location of the student's home, family income, family structure, the importance of religion in the family, and the level of education attained by the father and by the mother — the first was decidedly more influential than any of the others. Students from farms and villages with populations of less than 2500 participated the least, while those from cities with populations of more than 100,000 participated the most. This was found in 1964, in 1968, and again in 1970. It applied most strongly to civil rights participation, and in lesser degrees to student power and black organization activity. Interview data suggested that it was not simply a conservatism of beliefs that limited the participation of students from small towns, but also a lack of opportunity combined with a fear of reprisals against the students' families. Indeed, rural students attending college in urban sites were found to participate more in civil rights activities than urban students attending college in rural sites, though less than urban students in urban sites. Gurin and Epps use this and related data to argue against overpsychologizing of the question of black students' participation levels.

Students from more rural origins did, especially in 1970, express "the most individualistic, conventional views about success in our society; they also continued to accept traditional administrative authority at much the same level that was modal in 1964" (p. 253). The shift in attitudes between 1964 and 1970, then, did not spread evenly across the South, but occurred first in more urban locations. The other four demographic variables, however, made almost no difference

to students' ideology, while only family income and parental education influenced participation, and these to a lesser degree than has been commonly supposed by generalizing from studies of white students' activism.

Gurin and Epps examine the relationship between ideology and participation and find that participation was associated with more external control ideology, with blaming the system more than blaming individuals for racial inequities, and with commitments to collective action. The relationship is not necessarily as simple as this implies; in at least one college there was evidence that the participation led to the sustaining of ideology, rather than just the other way around.

That personal control was generally *not* related to activism emerges at this point. The original factor analysis of the Rotter scale is now seen to cleave the whole problem into two nearly symmetrical parts. Personal control was related to individual achievement, but not to activism; control ideology was related to activism, but not to individual achievement. The one exception to the first part of this formulation is a finding that the students who were most engaged in civil rights activities in 1964 combined internal personal control with a highly external control ideology. This almost mirrors the exception to the second part, that students who combined external personal control with internal control ideology ranked lowest in individual achievement. Gurin and Epps emphasize that an external ideology serves positive functions that have been ignored in much of the thinking about locus of control. In relation both to individual achievement and to activism, external ideology can be seen as a reality orientation for blacks, rather than as the passivism or alienation that externality has generally been taken to represent.

Individual vs. Collective Achievement?

Was it possible for students to integrate individual achievement and activism? This question opens the concluding section of the book. Gurin and Epps tell how, their own hopes aside, they expected individual achievement and activism to be polarized. They quote from a speech Stokely Carmichael made at one of the colleges they were studying:

One of the things that you are going to have to do is realize that Black people, especially in the colleges, can no longer afford the luxury of being an individual. We must see ourselves as a people. We can no longer accept that which white society calls success because to be successful, for Black people, in this country is to be anti-Black. (Gurin and Epps, p. 343)

Gurin and Epps's data do not seem to fit Carmichael's conclusion. The two sets of commitments — to individual achievement goals and to activism and social change — were repeatedly unrelated.

Let us be more specific. We pointed out in Chapter II that grade performance in college, as one indicator of individual achievement, was not related to activism. The independence of collective and individual commitments went far beyond that. We checked whether

activists and nonactivists aspired to different educational and occupational goals. We examined the individual goals of activists and nonactivists in 1964 and in 1970. We explored whether the type of activism in 1970 mattered as to the ease with which students handled personal and collective commitments. With only two exceptions the results repeatedly showed that high aspirations and performance just as often characterized the activist as the nonactivist student — no more, no less. Individual and collective commitments generally were not polarized, nor were they complementary to each other. Whether students engaged in one said nothing about their commitments or actions in the other. (p. 346)

This is a stunning finding, for this reader the most unexpected in the book. Gurin and Epps follow it with an analysis of four groups of students among the seniors in the six college cross-sectional study of 1970 and the longitudinal followup of seniors at one college in 1968: students they classified as Individualistic Achievers, Committed Achievers, Activists, and Unengaged. These groups were derived by first distinguishing between the seniors with unusually high individual aspirations and the remaining seniors, and then identifying within each of these groups the seniors who had been involved in civil rights or student power activities throughout their college years and those who had never been involved in either of these types of activities. About two-thirds of all seniors in the two studies fell into one of the four resulting combinations.

Up to a point, the characteristics of the seniors in these four groups matched what the earlier findings predict. The students came to college from much the same backgrounds, the exception to this being that the Unengaged more often grew up on farms or in villages, and that their fathers had attained less education than the fathers of the other students. The Individualistic Achievers and the Committed Achievers expressed stronger personal efficacy, less anxiety about tests, and stronger convictions about their own academic competence and ability to succeed in their future occupational roles. The Committed Achievers and the Activists more often blamed the system than individual blacks for racial inequities, rejected traditional work-ethic explanations of success, subscribed to political nationalism, and were critical of traditional governance of college life. The four groups did not differ in their college grades, a finding that seems to reflect an earlier inference that the seniors with less sense of personal efficacy and academic competence and with higher test anxiety were more successful in coping with these feelings than students who had dropped out by this time. Finally, men and women were found in equal proportions in the four groups, a fact that is more difficult to reconcile with Gurin and Epps's earlier findings.

The authors pursue the aspirations and motivations of the four groups to still further depths. They find that the Committed Achievers more often expected to enter professional schools, while the Individualistic Achievers looked more to Ph.D. programs. The Committed Achievers and the Activists alike expressed stronger social commitments through

their occupational choices, though, curiously, the Committed Achievers chose law and medicine almost to the exclusion of other occupations. The Committed Achievers in the longitudinal study finished their senior year with stronger feelings of personal competency than the already strong feelings of self-confidence they had expressed as freshmen. In this they were alone among the four groups. The Individualistic Achievers maintained a conventionality and optimistic acceptance of the social order, while all the other groups in the longitudinal study, even the Unengaged, left college "much less individualistic and conventional than when they had entered" (p. 363). Again, the Activists, alone of the four groups, left college with lower occupational aspirations than those with which they had entered.

Does this last finding signify that individual achievement and activism might have been irreconcilable in ways that the analysis failed to detect? Gurin and Epps acknowledge that the issue is complicated, but nonetheless present data to support an alternative interpretation.

The Committed Achievers, and only they, stood out in both 1968 and 1970 for:

contact with more faculty outside the classroom,
greater use of faculty in planning for the future,
finding these faculty contacts more helpful,
belonging to more campus groups,
holding more leadership positions on the campus,
participating especially in more governance committees and Afro-American groups,
identifying more often as student leaders and less often as casual types,
participating more often in at least some Black-oriented events, especially those concerned with the politics of Africa and political nationalism at home. (p. 365)

The authors argue that the Committed Achievers were simply more successful than the Activists in integrating personal and collective achievements. There was nothing different between the activism per se of the two groups. Rather, the quality of their campus experiences seemed to account for the divergence of these groups.

Of course, we do not know how the Committed Achievers developed these ties. It is hard to argue clear-cut effects from these data, and it is far too simple to urge the faculty to "do something" about the other Activists. Most students, not just Activists, probably would benefit from closer ties with the faculty. The Activists needed something — faculty models, successful leadership, social experiences — to help them put it all together, as the Committed Achievers had done. (p. 366)

This review has summarized the findings of the Gurin and Epps book much more extensively than is customary. Because of the complexity of the book, its argument might otherwise be inaccessible to many readers. For this reader, at least, it has been necessary to think through the book in writing in order to understand it. That the authors are a white and a black has clearly sensitized this research to many issues

and facts that might have escaped a white, and possibly a black, scholar working alone. One is struck, for example, by a comparison between the present book and Scanzoni's *The Black Family in Modern Society* (1971). Scanzoni's research is exemplary in its identification of the positive functions of black parents in the upbringing of their children. It argues quite as directly as the Gurin and Epps research that the individual aspirations and achievements of blacks are formed within, let us say by the rules of, the American system and its discrimination against minorities. All this notwithstanding, Scanzoni does not illuminate, indeed barely attends to, the relationship between blacks' individual or familial thriving and their larger collectivity. His sample was drawn from Indianapolis in 1968, which on account of both the year and the urban location should have lent it to deeper probing of political orientations than Scanzoni reports. One felt it as a failing even before the publication of Gurin and Epps's research, and now one's questions are multiplied.

Is it that students are especially sensitive to the issues Gurin and Epps explore? At the least, the research is in many ways a remarkable collaboration between the scholars and their subjects. The interviews quoted in the book conducted by black students a few years older than their subjects, particularly testify to this.

One wishes that a follow-up of some of these same subjects would be conducted in this decade, to ascertain how they made the transition to their occupations and postschool political activity. A definitive answer to the basic problem Gurin and Epps have delineated cannot be known until the later phases of these youths' development have been studied, using the tools the authors have assembled, if not still more powerful methods of analysis. Even then, however, one might not be satisfied. Not until discrimination against blacks has been effectively countered can we finally know how individual and collective achievement weigh in the balance pans of justice.

REFERENCES

- Billingsley, Andrew. *Black Families in White America*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968.
- Carmichael, Stokely and Charles V. Hamilton. *Black Power*. New York: Vintage Books, 1967.
- Scanzoni, John H. *The Black Family in Modern Society*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

The development of these papers was supported by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education pursuant to a contract with the National Institute of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their judgment in professional matters. Prior to publication, the manuscript was submitted to the Center for Policy Research, Inc., New York, for critical review and determination of professional competence. This publication has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the Center for Policy Research, Inc. or the National Institute of Education.

IRCD Bulletin

SUBSCRIPTION NOTICE

The **IRCD Bulletin** is published quarterly on a calendar year basis. The cost of a subscription is \$4.00 per year (four issues). In order to subscribe, please complete the form below and send it with your check or money order for \$4.00 to:

**Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Box 40
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027**

Subscriptions must be prepaid. Please make check or money order payable to Teachers College. Subscriptions are accepted for complete calendar year volumes only.

Please enter my subscription to the **IRCD Bulletin**. Enclosed is \$4.00. I understand that I will receive four issues.

Name _____

Address _____

Zip Code _____

Please check one of the following categories which best describes your affiliation:

- ☐ College or University
- ☐ Elementary or Secondary School/System
- ☐ Governmental Agency
- ☐ Library or Information Center
- ☐ Public or Private Agency
- ☐ Other (Please specify)

Back Issues of IRCD Bulletin Available

The following issues of the IRCD Bulletin are available from

**Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Box 40
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, New York 10027**

1-9 copies: \$1.00 each; 10-24 copies: \$0.80 each; 25-49 copies: \$0.60 each; 50 copies and over: \$0.50 each.

- Volume X, No. 1 New Perspectives on Old Issues in Education for the Minority Poor, Edmund W. Gordon. Winter 1975.
- Volume X, No. 2 Community, Competence, and Individuation: The Effects of Different Controls in Educational Environment, Joseph C. Grannis. Spring 1975.
- Volume X, No. 3 Ten Years of Decentralization: A Review of the Involvement of Urban Communities in School Decision-Making, Dale Mann. Summer 1975.
- Volume X, No. 4 A Psychological Anthropologist's View of Ethnicity and Schooling, Charles C. Harrington. Fall 1975.

Volume XI, No. 1 Equal Opportunity in Higher Education. The Current State of the Art and Recommendations for Change; A Review of the Studies of the Programs, Edmund W. Gordon. Winter 1976.

Volume XI, No. 2 Class Action, Community Organization, and School Reform: Aspira of New York, Philadelphia Welfare Rights Organization and Harlem Parents Union, Gertrude S. Goldberg. Spring 1976.

Volume XI, No. 3 Which School Resources Help Learning? Efficiency and Equity in Philadelphia Public Schools, Anita A. Summers and Barbara L. Wolfe. Summer 1976.

Volume XI, No. 4 Achievement Motivation and Black Children, W. Curtis Banks and Gregory V. McQuater. Fall 1976.

IRCD BULLETIN

Edmund W. Gordon, Editor

Teachers College, Columbia University
Box 40
525 West 120th Street
New York, New York 10027

Volume XII, Number 1

Address Correction Requested